

Koch, Kristine

From: Carl Stivers <cstivers@anchorqea.com>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 10:46 AM
To: Koch, Kristine
Cc: Patty Dost; ldunn@riddellwilliams.com; Amanda Shellenberger; Jen Woronets; Bob Wyatt; James McKenna; Cora, Lori
Subject: RE: [External]RE: Draft Prioritization of Information Requests on FS Sections 3 and 4
Attachments: 2015-09-08 Information Requests from EPA.pdf; 2015-09-08 LWG Letter to EPA re Information Requests.pdf

Kristine – To help prepare for our November 24, 10:30 am conference call on FS Information Requests, below is a list of items that we would like to discuss for the next “wave” of information from EPA. The numbers and summary descriptions of these issues are consistent with our September 8, 2015 original request submittal (reattached here).

Information Needs

- 2 – Explanation of decision tree application outside intermediate areas
- 5 – Explanation of methods and results used to identify groundwater plume areas
- 9 – Maps of different types (as defined by EPA) of PTW
- 10 – Not reliably contained and ex-situ treatment determinations relative to NAPL, PAHs, and DDx
- 12 – Areas and volume of sediments with DDx detections assumed to be subject to the Oregon pesticide rule and related contained in decision point in the disposal decision tree.
- 14 – EPA methods for defining NAPL in Figures 3.3-28 and 29.
- 24 – Riverbank data (in Access or Excel format) used in FS riverbank evaluations
- 25 – Details of sheet piling approach used (e.g., areas enclosed, liner feet, assumed heights, types of sheet piles, evaluations of deep water sheet piling).
- 29 – Explanation of SEDCAM modeling methods and results presented at the July 31 roll out meeting
- 30 – Explanation of the import volume calculations and assumptions for back fill volumes in Table 3.6-3
- 33 – Any additional residual risk figures not presented in Appendix H
- 34 – Explanation of residual risk assessments performed at a “Site-wide scale”
- 36 – Explanation of methods and results of tissue concentrations calculated from SWAC estimates
- 37 – Explanation of data and CSM used to support the statements about the importance of bedload movement on p. 4-3
- 40 – Explanation of why some Section 4 dioxin/furan PRGs are different from the Section 2 PRGs, and which PRGs are correct.

Requests for Corrected Information

- 1 – Correct and consistent versions of Figures 3.3-27, 3.6-02 through 3.6-07, 4.2-11, and 4.2-14 through 4.2-17.
- 4 – Confirmation that dioxin/furan residual risk HQs are correct, and if not, supply the corrected information. Also, if correct, explain why the BHHRA and EPA draft FS HQs are often so different?

Thanks.

Carl

Carl Stivers

ANCHOR QEA, LLC
cstivers@anchorqea.com
23 S. Wenatchee Ave, Suite 220

Wenatchee, WA 98801
Phone: 509.888.2070

ANCHOR QEA, LLC
www.anchorqea.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130.